

June 10-11, 2023
Washington D.C., USA



NORTH AMERICAN SCHOOL OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE

ACCESSIBILITY AND INCLUSION

2023 North American School of Internet Governance (NASIG)

June 10-11 2023 – American University

(raw transcript)

09 Keynote: Internet for all! Where are we - Doreen Bogdan-Martin

>> Fiona Alexander: Hi and good morning. Nice to see you all. We're going to show you a video first of Doreen Bogdan Martin, secretary general of the ITU, the first woman to run the institution in its 157 year history, also an AU alum so very proud here at American University. So let's go ahead and watch the video from Doreen and then we can get started.

>> Doreen Bogdan-Martin: I'm so pleased to join you, albeit virtually, back at my alma mater. American University, is where satellite and telecom policy first inspired me to start the journey that led me to where I am today, leading the ITU, the UN agency for digital technologies. It's great to see this year's NASIG program focus on digital issues affecting everyone. I can tell you digital is topping the global agenda too from across the United Nations to the G7 and the G20. So today's question, where are we in terms of Internet for

all? I think that question could not be more important. And the answer cuts across all of ITU's work areas.

So let's start with some numbers. Last year ITU did a show that 66 percent of the world's populations used the Internet. That means 1/3 of humanity is still offline. Women make up a disproportionate and growing share of that global offline population, outnumbering male nonusers by 18 percent. And that's up from 11 percent in 2019. And in least developed countries, just one in three people have access to the Internet. These disparities are why universal connectivity is one of ITU's top priorities. Reaching it requires closing not just one but several digital divides, between urban and rural communities, older people and youth, and people of different ability, gender, economic means, and education levels. Here are just some of the ways that the ITU works to tackle digital inequalities.

First, we track affordability which is a key metric in establishing universal connectivity across nearly 200 economies. Broadband commission affordability targets for mobile broadband have been met in 103 economies. Thanks to cheaper data plans and higher average income in developing countries. If ICT services including Internet use became more affordable globally in 2022, cost is still prohibitive for too many. On the digital inclusion and accessibility front, ITU works closely with governments, with industry, civil society and other UN agencies to develop ICT accessibility policies, guidelines, and technical standards. Our work involves making accessibility a requirement right from the design stage and it's resulted in more accessible telehealth systems for persons with disabilities, and safer listening devices, both of which are standards developed jointly with the World Health Organization.

ITU also works with partners on the ground to help get critical infrastructure to the communities that need it most. GIGA, the ITU UNICEF initiative to connect every school in the world to the Internet by 2030 is a good example of this and we're making important headway. Other projects are laser focused on empowering communities from building smart classrooms, to teaching STEM to girls in Pakistani smart villages, to digitally empowering South Malakula islanders to produce smart island coconut oil in Vanuatu. Scaling initiatives like these simply can't be done without bold multistakeholder partnerships and innovative funding mechanisms, and that's the idea behind Partner to Connect. Partner to Connect is a digital at that time coalition, global effort led by ITU to bring meaningful connectivity to the world's hardest to reach places. Over 600 pledges worth about 30 billion U.S. dollars have been made so far with projects ranging from building digital infrastructure to reinforcing digital skills to content localization and digital entrepreneurship. There is a large community of stakeholders making valuable contributions towards building this thriving digital ecosystem. As the only UN agency with

membership comprising not just 193 member states, but about a thousand leading tech companies, Universities, and international and regional organizations from around the world. And that makes ITU an important stakeholder in this ecosystem and an active voice in this community. This multistakeholder approach underpins ITU's governance work. And that is work to support an Internet that we can all enjoy. Our planning conference last year saw ITU member states highlight capacity building, information sharing, and best practices among stakeholders as key to building a multi lingual inclusive Internet for all. ITU also holds regular public open consult citation on international Internet-related public policy issues. It's our objective for all voices to be heard and respected with consensus-driven decisions made for the benefit of the global ICT community wherever and whenever possible. Ladies and gentlemen, when it comes to addressing digital inequalities to deliver an Internet for all, we know what we need to do. We know how to unleash digital opportunities for children and youth, women, and girls, people with disabilities, for everyone who finds themselves on the wrong side of so many digital divides. Now is the time to roll up our sleeves and get it done. And that's why I'm inviting you, each one of you, to get involved in ITU's work. Join our generation connect youth community, make a pledge to partner to connect, or contribute to the STG digital day that ITU is organizing together with UNDP and other partners on the sidelines of the SDG summit this September in New York.

Let's work together to erase all digital divides once and for all. And let's deliver on the UN sustainable development goals before it's too late and build an Internet that is affordable, accessible, and inclusive for everyone everywhere.

Thank you.

>> Fiona: Again, good morning. Great remarks from Doreen. I should probably introduce myself. I see some old friends in the audience but also some new folks. I'm Fiona Alexander. I also went to AU. Which is why we're so proud of our alumni here but when I was at American University I also interned at the national telecommunications and information administration which is the U.S. Government that participants in GAC and all these other things and was a part of the U.S. Government that was involved in a partner for ICANN for many years. So I spent 20 years of my life helping build and be a part of the ICANN community. So double welcome. To the ICANN fellows and things like that.

This morning we're going to talk about Internet for all. Great opening remarks from Doreen she provided. And we're very lucky to have a couple of old hands, I could say, and experts in the space to talk to us about it. I'll do just brief introductions. You may have already met Derrick yesterday doing his great remarks that he did.

But we'll do great I want destructions and then we'll hear a few opening remarks from a speaker, reactions to what Doreen said, and anything else they want to add. Then I'll ask a few questions and then we'll open it up. So you guys feel free to think about anything you might want to ask either of the speakers or me as we go forward.

We're happy to be joined this morning with professor Wolfgang Kleinwachter. I was at AU 25 years ago. So 25 years I think I've known both of these guys. Nice to see and you welcome to you AU. Wolfgang is a professor of emeritus in Denmark. Commissioner on the global commission on stability in cyberspace and a former ICANN board member. He's been involved in Internet governance issues since the early 1990s. He was appointed to the UNWISS working group. He served as an advisor for Internet Governance Forum and special ambassador of the Multistakeholder initiative. If you don't know what all of those things are, Wolfgang will be happy to tell you. On circle ID puts this up, if you haven't read any of his pieces, I encourage you to do so it gives you a great history of the space and where things are headed going forward.

And again I don't need to necessarily introduce Derrick Coghurn, but we're in Derrick's basically office. It's around the corner. This is his facility. We're happy he let us use it. Professor Kogod school of business, he is the faculty codirector of our Internet governance lab here at AU. So Derrick, why don't we start with you and sort of get your thoughts from Internet where are we now.

>> Derrick: Sure. So thank you for the introduction and really honored to be here with Wolfgang. Collaborated for many years in the spaces that Fiona talked about. I shared some of that yesterday, building gignat and working in IGF and around the world summit on the information society and so forth as well as the high level forum in Brazil. It was really exciting to hear Doreen talk about the work of the ITU. She is one of our treasured alumni as is Fiona. We're really proud of the work that she's done and have followed her career with great interest as she has continued to promote the idea of information and communication technologies for everyone and for making a change, for facilitating social and economic development. And she is such a good fit for the secretary general role because the ITU is so well positioned to do those things, to work in that space. Over the years sometimes ITU has been criticized and, you know, some very disparaging things said about the ITU. Sometimes warranted. But it is a space that allows most of the countries in the world to be able to gather one country, one vote deal with very technical issues and very societally important issues. So the ITU as Doreen was explaining has had a whole range of projects from youth development centers, women's technology issues, the women in ICT David they do now working on electronic commerce issues, and then really playing a central role in something that has led to many major changes in the Internet

governance space which started with the world summit on the information society. The ITU was at the center of organizing WISSIS, multi lateral and multistakeholder effort to get to that point, but the ITU was very central in organizing WSIS. All of the civil society caucuses and networks that came out of WSIS including the Internet governance caucus, dynamic coalition on accessibility and disability, all of those networks were active in these early spaces and the ITU played a central role in that space. So all three of its sectors play a unique role, the development sector, standardization sector, and so this is a critical organization and it's wonderful to have somebody like Doreen at the helm. Last thing I'll say before turning it over to Wolfgang is under previous secretary general Pekatarjani, the idea of communication as a right, everybody has the right to communicate what's promoted, and I see Doreen's vision of her time in office this ICT for all is a continuation of that. She's highlighting how critical this role is for making the Internet available to everybody, from a technology and substantive perspective. Really excited to be hear.

>> Wolfgang: Thank you very much and thank you all for the invitation and I feel also like back home because one of the things Doreen mentioned, the inspiration came from American university. I was teaching here from 1993 to 1995 at the SIS and when I arrived here in September 93, this was the first year of the Clinton administration and it was the Clinton administration which discovered Internet as an issue which goes far beyond technical specifics. Clinton's vice president Gore developed the so-called national information infrastructure initiative, the NII, which was the first political oriented document because Clinton and Gore's team recognized that all this information revolution, this technological revolution has far reaching political economic and social and cultural implications and, you know, from this it was clear already that this will be a permanent struggle because as soon as you talk about policy or economy or social issues you have conflict and you have different ideas how this should be organized. I think for the Clinton administration, it was more or less clear that said, okay, the best thing we can do with the Internet is to the decision making in the hands of the concerned and affected people. That means the provider of the services, the user the services, in the driver's seat because you know we as government we can probably provide an environment to settle all the problems but we should not make the decision. So far the whole development of ICANN then or debate -- before ICANN was established was, you know, who should more or less control, manage, the Internet and there was the priority for the U.S. Government which was also supported partly by the UP N commission was okay this should be done by NGO stakeholders but government would be involve as stakeholder. And this was diverse of the multistakeholder concept, what Doreen has just mentioned. And when the world summit information started. Some government which are more less uninformed, silent or, you know, had no clue what to do with the Internet in the 1990s realized suddenly that this will

have -- the Internet will not go away and this will have consequences. And several governments started, okay, and I remember argument from Chinese counterpart and when working companies madam Hu said private sector leadership was good for 1 million users but for 1 billion we need governmental leadership and so the conflict was there in the beginning of the year 2000. You know, who should manage the Internet. Could it be done by stakeholders, you know, with the private sector and more or less in the lead? Or should it be done by governments? The compromise which came out from the world summit was a mix. The basic consensus was it should be done by all stakeholders. So that means no -- the Internet does not need a leader. The Internet needs collaboration among all stakeholders to manage all the practical problems, including bridging the digital divide which was already one of the main issues during the world summit. But then you had different ideas how this corporation should be implement. And so it means the question private sector leadership versus governmental leadership. Or let's say government of control and sensorship or freedom, free flow of information and free trade. Was debated but not really settled. So you found some diplomatic language, you know, to move around this issue and let's, if you look now in 2023, 20 years after the world summit started that we have the same problems on the table but today, you know, the stakes are much higher because while the Internet was seen in 2003 more as a technical issue with some political implications, it's seen now as a political issue with a technical component. So no foreign minister was dealing with Internet issues in the year 2000. But now it's on the agenda of the summit meetings G7, G20, foreign defense ministers are dealing with the Internet and this makes a difference. So it means -- and you still live in this world where you can agree on some issues. I think the good thing with Doreen and the ITU is now that she has picked issues which are noncontroversial. Nobody has any argument to bridge the digital divide, to bring the next building Internet users on-line, to development infrastructure, you know, to invest in capacity building. All these are noncontroversial issues in implementing language. Some people say these are low hanging fruits where you can, you know, find an agreement, but on the on the other hand, the political conflicts, who controls the Internet and who, you know, so it's mainly a political question and here we have to clash between a democratic version of the Internet which is based on the principles of the multistakeholder model which are, you know, summarized in the declaration from 2014 which says policy development, inclusion, openness, transparency, accountability, and all this, this is also the basic principle on which ICANN was established. On the other hand, the more autocratic oriented states, mainly their governments, argue, you know, we have to have content control, cyber sovereignty, we have to protect our national Internet segment. All these are concepts and these have been never settled and this will continue. If you look now into the taking place this year and will continue next year around the new proposal on

the UN table the global digital compact. You see the same constellation. So ideas on our floated and say, okay, wait a minute, in the intrnt government forum which is a wonderful discussion platform for everybody where everybody can participate on equal rights, though governments have no chance to dominate, why not to introduce a new forum which is called now the digital cooperation forum and where we have created a wall for governments and stakeholders. So that means the same conflict we have 20 years ago is now reappearing on a higher level and in particular for the younger generation. My recommendation is study the history and then you understand much better what is ahead of you in the next five to ten years and it will continue. We will have 2025 the review conference on the world summit on information society. In 2030, there will be the sustainable development goals will reach an end. For the ITU that's really -- and I can only support what Derrick has said. It really was a great victory success or whatever because the election in Bucharest did see a Russian American. The counter candidate was Mr. Ismaelof, former minister from the Russian federation, and the interesting message was it was not only a victory for Doreen, it was overwhelming victory. And this gives you hope that the ideas of state control and whatever which was linked to the candidate of the Russian Ismaelof where Russia always tried to use the ITU as a letter timid body to introduce control over the Internet. This is off the table for the moment and so far, you know, we can -- the ITU as Derrick has said is really an important player, though sometimes it's labeled also in the American public ITU is bad, ICANN is better. So ITU is not bad. Sometimes ITU made some bad decisions but at the moment it's on the right track and it's really worse to become over engaged in the ITU, and particular also in the working groups which are unfortunately not so open to nonstate actors. But Doreen in the helm of the ITU probably this could be the next step in the ITU to open a little bit more so the working groups of the ITU council should be more open to stakeholders and you could be more engaged as academic persons you can write papers and probably today the environment is much more positive when they get input from outside than it was before.

Thank you.

>> Fiona: We talked a lot about the ITU and Doreen and history of institutional -- and institution building. But I'm going to ask a slightly different question. When I first started going to AU, they were just bringing the Internet to campus actually. They were just wiring the dorm. So I feel like I'm not that old but it sounds super old when I say it. But to both of you, what was your first experience of actually using the Internet, both personally and professionally? Do you remember? If you do, what was it?

>> Derrick: I was a graduate student here in Washington, D.C. at Howard University. I remember using links as a browser to be able to access the mono chromatic text based

Internet where you actually have little links you can click on. I thought it was the most fascinating thing in the world. I said this is revolutionary. This is going to change everything. Being able to slowly at the time connect to databases and download that information was just spectacular. So that was my first experience and I felt so strongly about it that as a political scientist I started advocating within the discipline that we take this seriously, both from a practical perspective in terms of how we can use the Internet both for research and coordination but also the political implications of it. So one of my fellow graduate students who came to AU later, Clarence Lusane was here. He and I both as political science doctoral students at the time started a training program to train political scientists on how to use the Internet. So we developed an Internet driver's license course for political scientists and -- (chuckles) -- and we started teaching political scientists and science organizations how to use the Internet for those purposes and to think about it for -- as a legitimate means of study and then over time, both of us, and particularly me, we really started to focus on ensuring that the academic disciplines would start to again both use and take the Internet seriously as a means of conducting research and as a focus of research.

>> Wolfgang: Thank you. You know, I grew up in east Germany behind the Berlin wall. And so far when I first realized that the Internet is there, I was mostly impressed by the ability to exchange e-mails and information and ideas without borders. So this was unbelievable in the 1980s and suddenly this was there, free flow of information was not only a line in Article 19 of the human rights declaration; it was suddenly reality. And this was extremely impressive. And by the way, disappearance of the traditional borders of time and space is still one of the biggest achievement which came with the Internet. We should not forget this, because with all the efforts, you know, to introduce some new barriers, you know, the Internet is still the free medium which, you know, developed an emergent in 1980s and 1990s. When I was here then at AU I was very proud to have an e-mail address. I still remembered Wolfgang @ SIS.edu. And I had an EDU address. At this time to have a.com address was bad people. EDU good people. Do not misuse the Internet for commercial purposes. I remember that. This was the discussion in '93 when some Internet freaks said, you know, this is the holy grail and we have to use it for the benefit of humanity and it could not be misused by commercials. And I remember there was a front page article in the "New York Times" where some students from school in Florida opened up their exams law firm and advertised this over the Internet, say they are flame for misuse of advertisement on the Internet. This was 25 years ago. Thirty years ago. '93 is now 30 years ago. This has certainly changed and we have benefited, certainly, from the commercial use of the Internet. So this is certainly good for everybody. If it comes to the academic dimension, what I realized then after studying so many different dimensions was

that the Internet governance is a complicated issue for education and research. So when I was a member of the UN working group on Internet governance, a lot of diplomats approached us saying where I can study Internet governance. And the answer was nowhere. Because it's a multidisciplinary phenomenon. Normally Universities are organized in faculties around discipline. You can start informatics, political science, communication, theory, international relations, cultural science or whatever. But Internet governance is everything. Has a technical, political, economic dimension, social dimension. So that means you have to study many disciplines. By the way, this was the starting point for the idea to develop across disciplinary curriculum which is reflected now in the idea of the summit school. So we started this in a UNESCO meeting in 2006 where we then started with a pilot project for summer schools and was involved in this also from the very early days. And I think that's the big challenge that the Internet does not -- or Internet governance does not have, you know, a single solution, though it has different perspectives. And so that means if you approach it from a commercial point of view, you have probably a different ideas than if you approach it from social scientists point of view or from -- as a diplomat you are different than an engineer. And that's the beauty of the multistakeholder model so that if you bring everybody on the table on equal footing, you can find out what is the right compromise and there will be no, you know, one size fits all solutions. Though we always argue, you know, if you want to solve some problems, you have first to identify the issue and then build the solution around the issue. And not to come to a solution and then put all the issues under a certain mechanism. And so far it's also, again, good to see now you find the issues bridging the digital divide infrastructure development and then to look what can be done. If you say, you know, government first then you will fail.

>> Derrick: One quick follow-up. Wolfgang and I talked a little bit about gigna net. I encouraged you also to go back and look at the gigna net research papers. There's an archive in the social sciences research council where you can go back and look at the giga net symposia, the papers. One of the things we're alluding to is that one of the things that was unique about giga net, although it came out of -- associated with a conference, the international communication association conference, it's much more than a communications academic network. It is a highly multidisciplinary academic network that tries to bring together all of these disciplines that we alluded to and as a result if you look at the symposium that takes place every year, you get papers from such a wide variety of perspectives trying to address these issues. So I just wanted to highlight that and encourage you to look at that archive.

>> Fiona: And maybe I know Wolfgang gave some good stories about the early days and the idea that .com was bad and that .edu was bad but it's true in the United States in the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Government funded the early development of these technologies and there actually had to be legislation in Congress to allow for the commercial use of the Internet, which is why these law students got in trouble because that legislation hadn't passed. So I'm a huge fan of history. I feel like you can't understand how to go forward if you don't understand your past but these are important things to keep in mind on this issue set.

So I'm assuming the people in the room just like ICANN and the issues we talked about are multistakeholder as well. So some people may be in academics, some people may work in civil society, maybe private, maybe governments. I'm assuming a range of people in the room in terms of what they do for a living or what they're pursuing. So on a that the ITU which we've talked about at length, what other groups or institutions do you see as key players in sort of the Internet governance space and again back to our theme Internet for all, where are we? Where else should people be paying attention or participating or observing depending on what their role is and what they choose to do.

>> Wolfgang: By the way, if you did not have a .gov address.

>> I have a.gov, EDU, and.com address just to be clear.

>> Wolfgang: Anyhow, the -- certainly I think the best mechanism or institutions which came out from these early years of discussion around Internet governance is ICANN and the Internet Governance Forum. So both have their problems, went through various phases of reforms and became better and better. Whatever you can say critically about ICANN, the Internet works. So you can send e-mails, go to websites. The DNS works regardless of the pandemic or the war. So that means ICANN is the neutral steward recognized by the whole globe, not controlled by one single government, not controlled by governments at all. Governments have an advisory capacity in ICANN. Certainly you have a procedure if governments disagree, you know, with additions of the ICANN board. Then you start consult citation and try to reach a consensus. You know, for the benefit of the whole community. So -- but ICANN has really a mechanism which blocks that a single stakeholder can control the whole mechanism. And this makes it successful, neutral, and acceptable to everybody with the exclusion of some political leaders in some countries which do not like, they do not have control. They want control. They want to control everything. It's not only Russia. Some other leaders. Iran, Saudi Arabia.

But by the way, interesting is China was so critical against ICANN but in recent years it's just a technical organization. So it means we are playing different things. Probably the new IP proposal which was introduced in the ITU a couple years ago was a test case. You know, how say could build and a new system. So my impression is the channel China is not interested anymore just to get bread out of the bakery, they have decided either we get the whole bakery or we are -- continue not much engaged but I think it works for the moment for Chinese business and they have to create firewalls so that means the risk that Chinese population will be influenced by western content is low. They can live with this. So at the ITF is really a discussion base where everybody can communicate and more and more over the years, the IGF also became more efficient. It has now subdary bodies, the policy networks, the best practice forum, produces messages for the outcome is now there because for many years IGF was criticized just a talking shop nothing come out from it. That means if government follows the ITF discussions, they can take the output as a source of inspiration for the national legislation or whatever. So the problem is that there was no - - it's no real link between the outcome from from the discussions and decision making in states. That's why the secretary general have appointed the leadership panel now cochaired by Windhof and Maria, the peace Noble prize winner and probably with the authority and US secretary general, the link between discussion and decision making could be a little bit closer so that the ITF is a good organization. As organizations play an important role I think the OCD in particular but this is only a -- you see now in the eastern or on the autocratic world, the organization which again and again adopts documents to bring more responsibility to the ITU which is now difficult after Doreen chairs the ITU. We have interesting digital corporation chaired by Saudi Arabia where 12, 15 Arab countries have concentrated now on Internet governments with the United Arab Emirates and also strong partners. So -- play an important role but probably also difficult to agree on Internet issues between Brazil, India, South Africa, China, and Russia. So probably they also can go for low hanging fruits, best practice exchange or something like that. So what I see is that if you want to build new organizations or mechanisms like this new -- this will be difficult, lead to conclusion, waist of resources. Be careful if you want to due to something new with all the experience. Vincent argued 20 years ago if it's broken don't fix it. The question is is the system broken? In my eyes not. We have problems. That's normal. That's life. But it's not broken. So it works.

>> Derrick: Fiona has asked what are some organizations we should think about participating and engaging with. So I'll start by saying in a multistakeholder environment, you have a responsibility to participate. So the fact that you have an opportunity, a seat at the table, that these spaces have been open for you to be able to register and go and attend, you should attend. You should make sure that you take advantage of those seats

you have at the table. Come prepared. Do your research. I think the panel we had last night, the closing panel was excellent and one of the things I took away from it -- where is Eduardo, I'm taking my notes for the summary. Don't worry. But one of the phrases was research, research, research. Do your research. You know, you chair the panel, make sure that you understand the concepts when you take your seat at the table. So let me just kind of start and go through some of those. So first back to the ITU. So one of the things that I have liked about the ITU is that you have large M members who are the member states and you have small M members. So you have organizations that can be members of the ITU, er, academic, research organizations and so forth. So if you are a part of one of those organizations and you're not yet a member of the ITU, you can join. And one of the things that you get from joining and their differential pricing structures to be able to join and so forth is that you can -- they're still pricey, no question about it, but there are --

>> It's expensive.

>> Derrick: No question.

But once you are a member, you can participate in those kinds of study groups and so forth and so on.

They do have reduced pricing for developing countries and so forth and so on. Maybe that's something Doreen could work on is maybe reduce that pricing even further because even the materials that come from ITU are expensive. But I wanted to highlight that because it is such a critical organization, it is possible even in the ITU for you to become a member and participate.

Incompletes to also go back to the WSIS, world summit on the information society.

So at the time, you know, that was the kind of multistakeholder process that you could have participated in if you didn't. You could register. You could register your organization, and you could go to Tunis and participate actively in those. You could go to Geneva and participate. So you could have participated in those activities. Coming out of the WSIS, there were two organizations, the Internet Governance Forum is the one that still exists but there was also the global alliance on ICT and development. And again those were both organizations that you could have participated in for those who did participate in the GADE, you may remember that one of the resulting organizations that came out of the GADE that still exists and plays a major force in IGF, ICANN spaces but also in the disability and accessibility spaces is G3ICT, the global initiative for information and communication technologies. I talked about them a lot yesterday and I'm really proud of them because it's really the only remnant left of the GADE. You had -- when the world summit ended -- for

those of you interested on this, on the table I have a flier for my book on transnational advocacy networks and the information society. It covers this history, you know, pretty extensively, but there were two of these multistakeholder beds that came out of the WSIS, IGF and the GADE. GADE was folk couched on the development issues, whereas the IGF was focused specifically initially on the Internet governance related issues but all the other development issues were supposed to be in the GADE. So G3ICT is an organization I would highly encourage people to pay attention to and engage with where where you can. One of the reasons that I also think that they are so important is yesterday remember all the conversations we had about accessibility testing and who can do accessibility testing and certification and so forth, well, G3ICT has absorbed something called the international association of disability professionals. If you go on their Web site you can see the pathways that we talked about yesterday for training people to do document accessibility, Web site accessibility, physical accessibility. So that's another organization that I would encourage you to participate in.

On the IGF side, I would highly encourage you to look at the dynamic coalitions. These are generally relatively multistakeholder interest networks, many of which came out of the WSIS process and evolved into the IGF space. So you can find a dynamic coalition that meets whatever interest you might have, privacy issues, children's issues, women's issues, freedom, the kindmic coalition on accessibility and disability is one of the oldest of one of the dynamic coalitions. If you're interested in accessibility issues or hopefully you are after this weekend, that's a coalition that you could join. So those are some of the networks that are actively around that I think are important. I just want to highlight a few others that I talked about yesterday. So I think transnational advocacy networks are so important. So many of them in specific issue areas. Yesterday I talked a little bit about accessibility in cities. So if you're interested in cities, there's something called the dynamic -- Ooh, not dynamic coalition. Disability inclusive accessible urban development network. The so if you're interested in accessibility in cities, that's a very active trans national advocacy network that you could get involved with. If you're interested in disaster risk reduction, there's the disability inclusive disaster risk reduction network. And this is for persons with disabilities but also allies who are interested in all of these areas and yesterday when we talked about the intersection between the information and communication technologies and these specific issue areas, these are perfect places for you to get involved and have an impact.

>> Fiona: Does anyone have any questions or comments they want to offer? Oh a. lot of questions.

Why don't we go here, here, and here.

We'll start in the back. I don't know if we have a microphone.

>> We had one yesterday.

>> Fiona: Jonathan's got it. He's going to bring it up. Then we'll go back to you and come down here.

Lot of hands up very fast. That was good for a Sunday morning.

>> Thank you very much. Lucian, founder of research federation. Our mission is to make sense of the Internet through access to data, research, and development of Internet standards. And I wanted to thank all speakers for a fantastic and interesting talk. Yeah, and Derrick, really echoing in my head is we have a responsibility to participate. And I'm hearing -- Wolfgang, thank you, you know, sort of the state of the nation where we're at now. And I'm hearing your appeal underneath to continue having faith in multistakeholderrism. And don't let government kind of just lean in there and try and sort it out unilaterally. And I hope I'm right in that summary. And I'm kind of sentrist left on politics. I love multistakeholderrism. It's what I believe in and I think it's always successful if you can include people. But I'm a little bit worried. After 20 years going back to Doreen's point, 1/3 of the world are not online and when we think about the Internet, I think about the Internet as TCPIP and what you were saying, Wolfgang, is that the sub structure of the Internet was designed by engineers who do not want commerce, they didn't want a commercial Internet. And that's left some gaps. Language around internationalized domain names and poor support for die crittetics into main names is locking people out at a national level. And that's still a problem for poor people. How is multistakeholderrism going to address those sort of problems? We're now seeing Brussels kind of know your customer, collect passports, find out who's on the Internet, attribution is still a problem. So we've still got these two very major 20-year-old problems old who is policy sort of problems. Where is multistakeholder going next? How are we going to have some really tackling those technical problems but not just techie's tackling those problems but the thinkers, policymakers? How are we going to go et that happening? Thank you.

>> Fiona: Wolfgang, do you want to answer? Go ahead.

>> Wolfgang: Yeah, thank you very much and to raise this point because this is the dilemma. And if we smore the multistakeholder approach as the -- forking aming the Internet, it certainly has weakness. For some people from the global south, they agree in principle, theoretically probably as a left wing person with the multistakeholder model but they say in practice it deepens the divide between the global north and global south because in all these stakeholder groups, it's the global north which dominates in the

technical -- in the stakeholder group of technical people, in the stakeholder group of the business people, and also, you know, civil society organizations. The main drivers and the loudest voices are headquartered in the global north. So that means if we want to bridge the digital divide, then to bring the next billion users from the global south. So we -- the risk is that division goes deeper. Not in numbers but in real influence, in policymaking. But that's why just to close the gap in numbers is not enough. So the way forward has to be capacity building and probably also institution building. So that means we have -- not yet mentioned here is important institutions, ISOC, has chapters around the globe. That means to make ISOC chapters in Africa, Latin America, Latin countries stronger so they have a stronger voice. We have this wonderful system in ICANN with the regional at large organizations. So that means make them stronger. So very often these are called at large structures. Small units. But it's more than 500 on our part of the large advisory committee. But a lot in the south are very weak. Make them stronger so that they can raise the voice and can rebalance the imbalance which we have in the system. That means to improve, enhance the multistakeholder system is the challenge, not to substitute it by something else.

>> Derrick: I would just add to that I see myself as an eternal optimist. So I'm optimistic and hopeful but I'm also concerned. I look at the multistakeholder system sort of as a global democratic process and where democratic processes, you know, you have to show up and you have to participate and you have to be a knowledgeable consumer and participant in the process. And even in our own country, I've become very concerned about the democratic processes shutting off voices, making it more difficult for people to participate, and so I think about some of those things at a global level as well. I am optimistic but it requires tremendous effort, strengthening institutions and capacity building.

>> Fiona: I might just offer the following perspective. For those of you that have been to ICANN or those of you that haven't and show show up tomorrow for your first time, when I first started dealing with ICANN, there were ten employees and at one point they couldn't afford to pay people. So you've got to think in 20 years, you know, we've collectively built a global governance regime that has scaled and still working on issues and it's fair to criticize how long it's taken on some issues, but things have gotten better but it has taken time. Naela's here and ICANN learn, if he will Lowe's, interpretation in the meetings. There's transcription in the meeting. None of that used to happen. So there have been -- when you look at historically what it was and how it's grown and what it's doing now, there has been great progress, but if you show up for the for the first time and this is what it is, this is not what it used to be but it's only this way because people demanded it, right? People

showed up and had their voice heard and made these requests and made these change and the community wanted it and because of the pressures of the UN, ICANN and ICANN leadership made a big point to push these things. It doesn't mean it's done. I always say that the multistakeholder model, I never call it anism, but the multistakeholder model is always growing, changing. It's always a work in progress. For years the government we called ICANN the DNS project as Wolfgang will remind me. Always going to work and evolve and change and it's kind of a living organism in some way and you've got to think of it that way would be my recommendation, but again as you show up tomorrow, keep in mind, at one point they had ten employees and couldn't afford to pay them, right? And that was -- I mean, 20 years ago is not that long ago actually when you think of that kind of stuff. But I think the microphone is -- where is it now?

>> I've actually got one if I could. It's me at the back.

And, you know, I'm the webcast guy. So the global digital corporation sessions at United Nations, on the first one I went to me cast it out to ISOC chapters, the Asian people asked me to do it because it was out of time for them and the ambassador from Rwanda who's one of the coordinators stood up and said whoever's doing this, stop. You're not allowed. And I was not -- so I hadn't, you know -- the situation is unsure. I asked Vint to intervene. Vint couldn't make any difference to it. Do you have any comments on that and how can we actually have an influence on this?

>> Fiona: So I will say that there's a -- when I first started doing this and sort of middle of my career, I remember having a conversation with my boss at the time and some reporters, because we were unveiling some new ICANN issues, and the reporter said oh we're never going to print the word multistakeholder. Can you describe it a different way. And I was like no. And now it's everywhere. But the problem is that people use it and co-opt it to mean different things, right? So different parts of the UN or parts of governments, including the U. S. sometimes will say something is multistakeholder when they mean they've hand selected people that can come to the meeting and they give input. I would say that's not multistakeholder. How do you make the UN more open? I think you've got to go to your government and complain and get them to push it, make it more open. But the global digital compact conversation and the fact that they were having these issue deep dives, I went up to New York for the one on Internet governance, it was weird that it's the only thing that I've participated in lately that was not being live streamed in a way that you could -- you could sign up and if you signed up you could be on the link and you could sign up to participate in person if you wanted to and that was a big change, you know, from days past, but it wasn't as open as like an ICANN meeting or an IGF or even an IT meeting which actually Web streams now as well.

>> Derrick: If I could just add to that, Joly, I think I was involved very early on at making some of these meetings accessible but it wasn't because it was allowed from the organizers. We would just sort of gorilla -- have gorilla remote participation. So, you know, I remember being in an ITU meeting where I used my phone to pair with my laptop and opened up a Web cam and started streaming, you know, back to South Africa when I was working in South Africa at the time, you know, just gorilla remote participation. Bringing my laptop and my cameras like Joly has here and so forth and I would just set up and people would say what is he doing. And I've got a big snowball microphone in the middle of the room and everybody's participating and, you know, it's remote participation. And it was good when the institutions finally started making official remote participation. We even had a dynamic coalition on remote participation at one point. Because again, it wasn't that long ago when, you know, this wasn't allowed and so we promoted and pushed for that. And I think just like with all of the multistakeholder aspects, you know, sometimes it's one step forward, two steps back, but we don't want to lose any ground. We want to keep pushing and making this interactive remote participation. And not just a one way stream to make sure it's clear that these technologies are so empowering that people from around the world can participate and can speak and can present and it's not just privileging the people who happen to be in the room face-to-face. We just have to keep pushing on it.

>> Joly: It seems the GDC process is seen as a multi lateral process and it's a listening thing. So the multistakeholder aspect is just we can speak to them but it's for them, it's not for us.

>> Wolfgang: I think that's a really important point, because Fiona as said, multistakeholder is now such a nice word that even China is using it and said we have to work with multistakeholder. Because they understanding of the process was different. You know, over the years I've seen two different understandings. One is that some governments argue that you see that the intergovernmental process is embedded in a multistakeholder environment and the other group says, you know, multistakeholder processes have to be controlled by the governmental processes. So these are 22 different things. You know, intergovernmental negotiations, intergovernmental treaty system will continue to exist. It will not disappear. So you cannot substitute the system of regulation between 193 member states by a multistakeholder model. But it's an enrichment. It has broad end our way how we make policies. But the question is the interrelationship. Here comes that we have a definition. We have principles but no procedures. How the input from nonstakeholders in governmental processes leads to an impact. So we had this already in the WSIS phase, I think Derrick you were involved when the civil society caucus made 93 proposals for the intergovernmental declaration and then the next draft came

out, which acted and from the '93 proposals just two were incorporated indubious language in one of the 120 paragraphs. So this was really they took the input, ignored it. So we call this in a very hot meeting with the intergovernmental council, governmental ignorance or governmental arrogance and then someone was saying you know you have not the right, not everybody will have its input reflected in the final document, but if you make 93 proposals and nothing is reflected, this is really arrogant and ignorant. This was 20 years ago. Now more this as you have said in the discussion on the global digital compact, this could reappear on a high level. The only way forward is really to make -- to put this on the table as a question and to say that we need procedures how input leads to impact. In ICANN, policy development processes, so you have to document. If you write a comment, then, you know, ICANN has to give a rational why it has ignored or what it has taken. So this is what you can expect from governments, that say comment on the input and then give you a rational why it was rejected or how it was incorporated. So that means we have to enhance the procedures for the interaction but we do not have such procedures. So this is work ahead of us.

>> Fiona: Pass the mic.

>> So my question relates to what professor Cogburn mentioned by answering the first question, the silencing the voices of the people. I feel like it's encouraging -- very encouraging to see all those initiatives that work on connecting the unconnected, but at the same time in some part of the world there are like international downs imposed by repressive government. Like this year alone there are more than 80 shut downs in 21 countries. So that's a lot. Even in my country we are going through one of the longest international shut downs in like 50 at which points in my country there are like 500 days of Internet shut downs happening right now. So I'm just wondering, you know, if like organization that works on the Internet open, SS, I'm just wondering if there is anything like ITU or any of those initiatives and organizations that you just mentioned working on like navigating these issues of end connecting the unconnected.

>> Fiona: Maybe I'll start if you guys want to add in. The issue of Internet freedom and shut downs as a conference of its own. It actually happened last week in Costa Rica called rights Con. Just like IGF, there's a whole group of people in the world that are very focused on Internet freedom and free expression and keeping the world connected. But, you know, IGF has those conversations as well. I do know the freedom yn line coalition which the U.S. was involved in setting up with like minded countries has an Internet shut down task force and they're always looking at these issues and advocating, but, you know, as a former government official, it was difficult to work to talk to other -- I mean, part of dispoamy is talking to everybody, right? Even someone that you're having a dispute with. Even your

closest friends, you have to talk to people. And you know, it's imperative in a government to government dialogue that you try to talk to people and explain to them the harm Internet shut downs do and what they're losing out not just on free expression but economic growth and things like that. But it just requires constant engagement and constant vigilance, not just by governments but other stakeholders. But freedom online coalition is a place you can look. Freedom online coalition has its own multistakeholder element. They have an advisory network that you can try to be involved in. But I might look at some of the things that happened at rights con last week where this would have come up but if you guys have others.

>> Derrick: Just want to add to that I was also going to mention rights Con. I don't see Julianna but I know she was at rights Conn, I think. And so that's one of the things I was going to recommend this. Is not an area that I'm particularly focused on but you know how important it is and I know there are networks of people who work on privacy enhancing technologies and ways for people in repressive countries to be able to be as safe as possible while still having communications and collaborating with people outside of the country. So -- I know Robert Gary used to work on areas like that and others, so...

>> Hi, my name is David Macky and my question is related to the multistakeholder history. I am here today participating because of the at large community and I believe the history of the multistakeholder model, the inclusion of end users through the at large commune was an innovation which possibly is unique in human history. If you could help me understand the decision why the end users were decided to be included in the multistakeholder model and possibly is the decision to include end users reaching the potential that was expected 20 years ago? Thank you.

>> Wolfgang: I can't do this because I was involved in this discussion in '96, '97 before ICANN was established. So there was an initiative by John Pastel to, you know, create a totally new format where nongovernmental organizations like the ITF, ISOC, and the YANA would incorporate these business organizations, like the international trademark association. And in the governmental organizations, like BIPO and ITU to have mix of such organizations and this was the so-called MOU/HACCTD. Nobody understood what it was but this was the --

>> It's the international ad hoc committee on new generic top level domains.

[APPLAUSE]

>> Wolfgang: Wonderful.

By the way, some people argue this is John Pastel's trick, that means if nobody understands it he can do whatever he wants. So that's enough freedom to do it.

But there was seen a little bit critical also to U.S. Government said because the ITU would have been the -- of this MOU. There was some dubious ideas to move to Geneva and all this. So the U.S. Government at this time it was -- together with Gore who said we have not only let's say governments and technical people and business people, end users play an important role, the million end users. So if say after the first bylaws for ICANN said the board should -- the decision making power should be in the hand of the providers and users of services and governments should be an advisory capacity. That was normally the power triangle. You see governments in the driver's seat and then input from business and from the people in the street which give you a vote for elections and letter demands for government but you know the model was turned around and suddenly, you know, the citizens, the people, and the business medicine the driver's seat and governments in advisory capacity. So the problem was how to identify representative and so the first idea was representation and representation comes with elections. It was very natural in the first bylaws. So business organizations we have the supporting organizations, they have democratic procedure to delegate people in decision making, the board of directors but you know how to get nine so-called at large directors into the board. And the idea was elections. It was seen you know how to organize for millions and millions of people global whrxes and the first idea was let's test it. It was mechanism of elections and the first pilot was let's try it with five at large directors. So and in five regions so you had a system where you could nominate yourself or you were nominated and you could register as a voter but there was a lot of discussion about misuse, how the system will work, how people will participate. So nearly 500,000 people participated in this election. They produced five directors which were good directors and then happened the 9/11 and I think this was the moment, the turning point in my eyes where this project of cyber democracy was turned into a project of cyber security and then, you know, the risk was high because, you know, the elections produced in the -- a guy from Europe Andy Magun who was famous in Germany, which was okay, if you have elections, you never know what's the outcome of these elections. And the debate started, you know, how we can make the process safe and that is not misuse and avoid manipulation or corruption of the process or things like that. And so the idea was let's not have elections. Let's have, you know, and this was the first of the nomination committee. Let's have nominations and for the moment the number of at large representatives in the ICANN board was reduced from originally nine to five and then to a nonvoting liaison later it was one voting member where a large advisory committee, one voting member but the nomination committee nominates eight directors and the expectations was that a lot of these directors going by the nomination committee will

represent the users, which is not always the case but if you have go back to the history, you had a lot of good representatives of Internet users which made its way to the board of directors while the nomination committee. So this was in short complicated history and the system is not perfect and, you know, because if you look to say large structures, you know, sometimes it was labor champions without champions so it means big nongovernmental organizations which represent users are not part of this family so that means a lot of work to be bun dit at large advisory committee to be more a attractive so it becomes representative of the users but this is on the agenda 2030. Thank you.

>> Fiona: Maybe historically to add some of the principles that under GERDed what Wolfgang has discussed, we keep talking about multistakeholder and ICANN is a multistakeholder institution. So in the early days of ICANN no one used the term multistakeholder. That term actually came out of the WSIS process later on. But sort of the foundational principles were bottom up open participatory shared decision making. That meant you had to have the user perspective integrate. How did you it, the voting experience, that's the how, but sort of the foundational principles of creating it and this was very different from a straight intergovernmental thing but that's why you have the structure that you have.

>> Derrick: Just want to add one -- so I think you're absolutely right to identify this as such an important moment in history and I would say that early on people were studying ICANN as a multistakeholder institution. People were signing ICANN as a case study in how do you achieve some kind of global multistakeholder process. I want to make one quick little story. I remember going to an ICANN meeting and you'll all see how hectic andki I don't telletic it can be. Cathy Kline yesterday talked about sort of the differences between young people running around in black T-shirts and people in suits and I was somewhere in the middle probably and I remember turning a corner and mist sustainably walking into a GAC meeting and people looked at me like I had two heads when I walked in the door. I knew I wasn't supposed to be there. But you're absolutely right in identifying its historical importance.

>> Fiona: Two more questions one up here and then promise you'll be our last one.

>> Sriti from Nepal. Always a pleasure to hear you, processor Wolfgang, you simply the process so well. And professor Derrick, you know, it is absolutely right that we need to do more research in terms of how we are going to develop the process. But my question is, you know, it has been 20 years since we are practicing multistakeholderrism and, you know, it is being passed on the values are worked on, but in the reality, currently if you look at the scenarios, it is like well rightly said it has become more popular but when it comes to

the engagement style side, there is still a lot of issues at grassroots level, lower economics, if you go down there there are issues. So are we doing it right in terms of how we are practicing it or is there a definite strategy that we have to follow so it becomes more effective? Because 20 years is a long time and still we are not able to accept -- I still remember it was back then in 2018 when we were discussing about whether to renew the IGF: There was in question raised. So those kind of questions are still coming up. So I think we have to work on looking into the strategy and even I did research about multistakeholder practice. In 2018 we had a booth here to feature that thing, but -- and a lot of the participant showed their interest but the reality is it has become more popular and engagement level it is something different, especially for the lower economies, you know, it's a very hard. It's we are still struggling. The government doesn't recognize the other stakeholders that is a reality. What are your takes on that? Thank you.

>>

>> Daicialg: I'll take a first quick crack. That's a great question are we doing it right the way you phrased that is really powerful. What I'll say just quickly is I think in many ways we are getting some things right, not only because we're still here because the process that's still here has pushed back against all of the pressure to move away from a mull tie stakeholder model. All the things we talked about capacity building, lots of effort put into capacity building certainly continues to help have us do the right thing. The efforts at remote participation have been incredibly important for people who can't be in the room. And so one thing I would say you mentioned the renewal of IGF, so if you look at the two institutions I looked at, the G ADE and IGF, the GADE didn't get renewed. IGF in my assessment was certainly doing a number of things right that the GADE wasn't doing and that's why I think we still have the IGF and we still have these WSIS review processes and so either to.

>> Wolfgang:

>> You raise a delicate issue because the whole multistakeholder approach is based on goodwill and mutual trust. And if you have no goodwill, it gets difficult. And if you have trust close to zero, it's even more difficult. So because the whole merging of the Internet was based on mutual trust. So people trusted each other. So it was a small community where everybody and, you know, which indeed was 1 million people it's much more easier than 5 billion people. Now you have all the head pedophiles and war mongerrers on the Internet with all technology can be used and misused. So that means not only good guys on the Internet. That makes it difficult. And another problem is that effective multistakeholder policy development and decision making needs also let's say equal

participation and here comes the issue of the resources. So that means the problem is that a lot of these user organizations, civil society organization have much lower resources and then we have the problem of burnout because you have some activists working 20 hours and one or two or three years say I cannot do it anymore. So it's too big. The problem is it starts with financing to go to conferences, you know, flights, travel. So the argument in business was, okay, citizens, users pay taxes which enable governments to pay their travel bill. Say byproducts which enable business to send people to such conferences, but the end users are paying dwofts and businesses and nothing left for themselves. And this is unfair. That's an issue, you know, to offer the resources which are needed for equal participation of at large or end users or civil society organization in all these processes. So that's a big issue. I do not have an answer. But to raise this issue and to call for a fund or whatsoever which can help a lot, I can understand with your young generation program and fellowship program and things like that so it means ICANN is a good example. But if you go to the United Nations you do not have a similar process. So far you have an imbalance in this model which is a good model but, you know, it's a long way to become a fair model.

>> Fiona: Our last question and then in answering that you guys can give some final thoughts as well.

>> My name is U.S.ubramanyan, this is actually about the imbalance and how to correct the balance. So far the effect of the multistakeholder organizations have been regulatory process and regulatory hurdles for improving access and a whole range of Internet issues, especially with ITU as a multi lateral body but I see that ITU is doing quite a lot of good work and is trying to do a lot of good work but that happens to be some mismatch or something missed that appears to be a distraction and it's not just the regulatory pressures that is hampering Internet progress but commercial model, underlying commercial model and if the multistakeholder process is concerned about cable and telecom model that is promoted by the cable companies, the Internet organizations, they don't have perfect business model either. And I had a conversation with somebody in the breakfast this morning and I was saying Google Facebook, Microsoft are good guys and they all laughed and they said Google Microsoft and Facebook are bad guys and boat of us are speaking the truth in the sense that it started as an innovation by entrepreneurs. At some point of time the big boys stepped in with money and they took over and it became commercial. It's at that layer of growth that it transitions from what is development and good to something totally commercial and I think that would be the root cause of problem for many initiatives that could cause a lot of progress and is government doing anything about this problem at a deeper layer?

>> Wolfgang: Yeah, I think the risk of capture is around us since 25, 30 years. So that one group, you know, it's so strong that it will dominate. And in so far the world has changed over in the last 20, 25 years. So I think when we had to first trace, Google was still the small company, don't do evil. Everybody said okay, here we have good guys, Serge and Page, you know, saving the world and making everything better, give you service for free and, you know, finding the money that they can do these free service for everybody for the whole world. So if you get big, then it's different. So in so far also the approach to regulation, we didn't discuss regulation so far, has also changed, because between saying of a French flosser who said between the strong and the weak it's love which will be rates and freedom which suppresses. So that means freedom works only if you have certain equal partners. So that means if you have an unequal relationship, then the law will help you to rebalance it. And in so far it's interesting to see that today a lot of these big corporations realize that regulation is not bad as it was seen 25 years ago as to civil innovation and, you know, to stop economic development. Now say, okay, regulation will also make the -- you know, it's needed to develop a system which is more fair. And it's not only free but also fair. And I think this is the big challenge. And if you look into the new issues which are now on the table, the terminology AI governance is now flying around so that means do we need special governance mechanism for development of particular intelligence or for the use of particular intelligence? How this is constructed. Is ICANN also inspiration for AI governance, all these are good question. So it's work in progress and you have to have a certain regulatory framework. I think this is more or less accepted today. Regulation not in a sense of strangulation or covenants sorryship. So regulation to a playing field where everybody can participate as more or less an equal partner based on certain rules. We are not here because it's a power struggle, a struggle around prophets and influence and we should not be naive. Say, okay, take everything and I follow you, everybody has its own interests, but the beauty of the multistakeholder mechanism, if it's implemented well, is that you could find a fair share of the mechanisms through which would allow that everybody is either equal unhappy or equal happy.

>> Derrick: I'll just add to that. This is a huge question. Great question. And I'll just say that in a multistakeholder model, the idea of the participants, those stakeholders being equal is important to have this balance out. And I would say that we know that they're not equal in a wide variety of ways. That's why we talk about capacity building and institution building. So give you an example. So on the private sector side -- well, let me start on the government side. Governments have tremendous resources to organize, to meet, to plan in advance. They know exactly what their interests are when they go into a he get moo like the ones we're talking about. The private sector also has those resources, institutions that can organize and focus like a laser on what their interests are in a particular meeting and

they engage in that meeting with a goal of making sure the outcomes of those meetings meet their objectives as best as possible. Civil society, the other part of this stool is so heterogeneous. The interests are so heterogeneous all over the place. Differ tremendously. And we don't -- or haven't, initially didn't have the kinds of institutions that would allow for filtering through, debating those civil society interests, those parts of the multistakeholder interests sharpening and focusing to know exactly what this group wants to get out of this process and that leads to, you know, an imbalance. The private sector would frequently meet before the meetings to decide what they wanted to be able to have as an outcome. Governments could do the same. So it's an imbalance in terms of this multistakeholder triad that we have to keep trying to address.

And just one last thing about regulation. So with AI, for example, this is an example of where the companies are asking to be regulated. They're saying that we can't regulate ourselves. We have to keep going full out because of this competitive landscape, but this is an existential crisis potentially and you should be putting regulations in place. They're asking for it. Last couple of days the heads of all the open AI and the heads of all the advanced AI companies are saying you need to regulate us because this technology that we're developing has the potential to cause extinction in the human race. This is what they said. They're saying you need to regulate us and yet the G7 met and said we'll have a committee by December to come up with something.

>> Fiona. So with that.

[LAUGHTER]

>> Fiona: Sort of negative note, I will say I have a lot to say on AI because we did put together some principles in the -- there were some baseline rules for AI that perhaps these CEOs are not aware of.

Any way, thank Derrick and Wolfgang for coming today and for you guys for great participation and great engagement here. We are a little bit late that's why I'm getting the look over here.

So I know we have a break. I don't know what time you guys want to start. Do you want to do 10:45 and stay on schedule?

Okay. So --

>> Jonathan Zuck: We have a break going until 10:45. So that starts now.

I have one anecdote that I'll just throw in here, the NTIA started multistakeholder experiment that was about privacy in mobile applications. And I remember showing up to the meeting and it had lots of multistakeholder participants but I was the only one there actually representing mobile app developers. And so I remember getting up and saying I'm a really big fan of multistakeholderism but sometimes you feel like the steak. Enjoy your break.

[LAUGHTER]